

THE ACTION OF CHESAPEAKE PRESBYTERY.

I, for one, want to say Amen to the resolutions of Chesapeake Presbytery in regard to the Laymen's Movement, in asking President Taft to make the opening address.

I have as much respect for Mr. Taft as President of United States as any one and am ready at all times and under all circumstances to pay him that respect. But when it comes to ask him to take part in a convention of Christian men, those who hold and teach that Christ is the Son of God, and in every sense God, equal to the Father, thereby necessarily recognizing him as a Christian man and as such a part and parcel of the Christian Church, he stands in a very different light. I, for one, am totally opposed to such a movement as calculated to do almost irreparable harm to the Church. I, for one, as much as I want to see the movement on the part of the laymen grow and become more and more useful in extending the Master's Kingdom, would much rather see the laymen of our Church withdraw from the association of all others and have one of our own, than for even one of them to take part in a meeting where the Master is dishonored, by indorsing one as a Christian man, belonging to his Church, who utterly repudiates him as Lord, and denies him as Mediator and Saviour.

God forbid any such move on the part of any of our laymen.
 W. W. M.
 Statesville, N. C., September 19.

THE NEW PROOF TEXTS AND THE AMERICAN REVISED VERSION.

James L. Martin, D.D.

Your recent editorial on the above subject impels me to lend a hand.

I agree with you: "There are many who feel that there are serious defects in the American Revision, and that if we will but wait awhile a better translation can be made. Others feel that there is a rationalistic tendency in some of its renderings, in which they can not concur."

I speak as one who has carefully read the whole of this Revision from Genesis to Revelation, and am now nearly through the second reading. I am thoroughly satisfied a better translation can be given—not a compromise translation, where conflicting tenets have pooled their interests and sacrificed the truth, or to say the least, broken its point and hacked its edge. If this is the best modern scholarship can give us as the "nearest approach to the mind of the Spirit," then for me, at least, "The old (King James) is better."

For example: Take Mark 10:14, and turn to the Greek. King James version: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God."

American revision: "For to such belongeth the Kingdom of God."

In the original it is the genitive (of) yet in the American it is translated to the sign of the dative. In the original it is the simple verb of existence, *estin* (is), yet in the American it is translated, unnecessarily, "belongeth." Now which is nearest to the original and therefore to the "mind of the Spirit"? I make no com-

ment on the animus of this change. The argument is not weakened after all; for if the Kingdom of God belongeth to the children, then, of course, to those children must belong the "seal" of their own Kingdom, equally as if the children belonged to the Kingdom. Thus the compromise fails to accomplish its end. But why subject the Word of God to such a compromise? Why depart ruthlessly from the "mind of the Spirit"? Truly "the old is better." King James says in other words substantially: "The children belong to the Kingdom, ergo—Suffer them to come," etc. American revision says literally: "The Kingdom belongeth to the children"—whatever that may mean—ergo suffer, etc. But the question is, Which is the most faithful translation of the inspired original? Shall our Assembly endorse this in its proof texts? Never, I am sure, if they be guided by the Spirit of Truth.

Now take another sample: Jno. 9: 35-38. "Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and finding him, he said, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, And who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him? Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast both seen Him, and He it is that speaketh with thee. And he saith, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him."

The rendering in these verses is the same in King James, Anglican and American versions. What I desire to call attention to is the marginal foot note, which contains the critical comment of the American Committee of Revisions on the clause: "And he worshipped Him," verse 3; and on the clause "Son of God," in verse 35. That comment is as follows: On verse 35, "Many ancient authorities read 'The Son of Man.'" On verse 38, the comment is: "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature (as here) or to the Creator." If the words in parenthesis, "as here," do not teach that this act of reverence was paid here to Jesus as a "creature" and not to him as "Creator", then what do they teach? And if the teachings of the foot note is not rationalism, then what is rationalism? This foot note is part and parcel of the American revision; it is incorporated as an integral part of their version, which was adopted and authorized by the revisers, no matter whether the foot note received the votes of all its members or two-thirds, or only a majority, one thing is undeniable: at this point in the work of revision, rationalism gained a signal victory. Shall our Assembly endorse it? Truly the "old is better"—being minus this rationalistic foot note. Is not this foot note sufficient warning to the Church that rationalism at certain points, was a prevalent factor in the American revision? That it was not only prevalent but wide-awake, this foot note gives ample proof. (This foot note is copied from *Bourgeois Reference edition of Thomas Nelson & Sons*, page 105.)

The reader will understand that my objection is not to the critical exegesis of the Greek word translated "worshipped", as applied to "creature," or to "Creator"; but my criticism applies to the statement in parenthesis,—"(as here)"—teaching, that in this instance it was an act of "reverence" addressed to Jesus as a "creature," and not a "Creator." Of course if Jesus is a creature then he is not a Creator; and what more could rationalism ask or teach?

Other samples of compromise with rationalism and